Application No. 10/774504 Amendment dated 18 May 2006 Reply to Office Action of 22 February 2006

Page 6 of 8

REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Office Action mailed 22 February 2006. A Request for Continued Examination is filed together herewith.

Prior to this paper, claims 1-5, 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 29-36 were pending. In this paper, the Applicant has:

- amended claims 1 and 36;
- cancelled claims 2, 30, 32, 33 and 35; and
- added new claims 37-39.

The claim amendments and new claims are submitted to be completely supported by the application as originally filed and to add no new matter. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 29, 31, 34 and 36-39 are pending after this amendment.

Withdrawn Claims

Claims 4, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22 have been withdrawn by the species election filed 22 July 2005. However, these claims depend from claim 1, which is submitted to be allowable (as discussed below) and generic to the non-elected species. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 4, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22 are entitled to consideration as provided by 37 CFR § 1.141 and respectfully request rejoinder of claims 4, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22 upon allowance of claim 1.

Rejections based on US patent No. 2,734,222 (Kiba)

The Office Action raises US patent No. 2,734,222 (Kiba) in connection with claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 29, 31, 34 and 36. The Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 29, 31, 34 and 36 patentably distinguish Kiba.

As understood, Kiba recites a hinge structure for molded boxes. Figure 6 of Kiba depicts a cover (12) having a protruding portion (24). An integrally formed pintle support (15) projects downwardly from protruding portion (24) to provide a pair of cylindrical pintles (16). Receptacle (11) comprises a pair of hook members (17) integrally formed with sidewall (14). Hook members (17) each comprise a bight portion (18) and an inner wall (19) which is laterally spaced with respect to wall (14) and extends substantially

Application No. 10/774504 Amendment dated 18 May 2006 Reply to Office Action of 22 February 2006

Page 7 of 8

parallel thereto. Pintles (16) are received between a bearing surface (22) and the bights (18) of hook members (17).

Claim 1 (as amended) recites "a hiding member having a first hiding member portion located forwardly of the hinge pin and extending from a section of the first part located on one transverse side of the hinge pin to an opposing transverse side of the hinge pin and a second hiding member portion which extends rearwardly from the first hiding member portion on the opposing transverse side of the hinge pin and extends from a forward side of the hinge pin to a rearward side of the hinge pin". Kiba fails to teach or suggest a hiding member having such features. While Kiba discloses a "protruding portion" (24), the entirety of protruding portion (24) is located on a forward side of pintles (16). While protruding portion (24) may arguably extend from one transverse side of pintles (16) to another transverse side of pintles (16), protruding portion (24) does not extend from the forward side of pintles (16) to a rearward side of pintles (16). More particularly, protruding portion (24) does not incorporate both a "first hiding member portion ... extending from ... one transverse side of the hinge pin to an opposing transverse side of the hinge pin" and a "second hiding member portion which ... extends from a forward side of the hinge pin to a rearward side of the hinge pin" as recited in claim 1. In addition, protruding portion (24) is merely the edge of the Kiba box. The purpose of protruding portion (24) is not to hide the hinge pin as recited in claim 1.

Based on this reasoning, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes Kiba. Claims 3, 5, 7, 29, 31, 34 and 36 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to patentably distinguish Kiba for at least this reason.

New Claims 37-39

The Applicant has added new claims 37-39 which are submitted to recite features which further distinguish the prior art of record.

Application No. 10/774504 Amendment dated 18 May 2006 Reply to Office Action of 22 February 2006

Page 8 of 8

Conclusions

In view of the amendments and comments presented above, the Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

If there are any remaining issues preventing the allowance of this application that may be resolved by way of telephone conference, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Respectfully submitted, OYEN WIGGS GREEN & MUPALA LLP

By:

ext. 9043

e-mail:GNMDocket@patentable.com